REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims

of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

• Claims 1, 3-6, 8-18, 20-23 and 26 are currently pending.

No claims are canceled herein.

No claims are withdrawn herein.

• Claims 6, 8-16 and 21 are amended herein.

No new claims are added herein.

Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification, as

originally filed, and the claims. For example, support for amendments to claims 6 and

16 can be found in claim 21. The amendments submitted herein do not introduce any

new matter.

Allowed Claims

The Office Action indicates that claims 1, 3-5 and 26 are allowable. Applicant

would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1, 3-5 and 26. These claims have

not been amended herein, and therefore remain in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 8-15 and 21-23 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

Claims 6, 8-15 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly

being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this

rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21, with the amendment herein, recites

statutory subject matter under § 101 at least because the claimed computer-readable

medium "stores" the computer-executable instructions. Therefore, the claimed

computer-readable medium cannot embody a transitory signal, since a transitory signal

is not capable of having instructions stored thereon. Consequently, claim 21 (and its

dependents) is limited to tangible embodiments.

Claim 6 is amended herein in a manner similar to how claim 21 is structured. As

such, the claimed computer-executable services and computer-readable information are

stored on the computer-readable medium. Therefore, the claimed computer-readable

medium cannot embody a transitory signal, since a transitory signal is not capable of

having services and information stored thereon. Consequently, claim 6 (and its

dependents) is limited to tangible embodiments.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asks that the Office withdraw this rejection.

Cited Documents

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the

Application:

• Zintel: Zintel et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029256

• Saint: Saint-Hilaire et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0101294

Fedotov: Fedotov et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0181796

Serial No.: 10/717,830 Atty Docket No.: MS1-4172US Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie Claims 6, 8-18 and 20 Are Non-Obvious Over Zintel in view of Saint and

further in view of Fedotov

Claims 6, 8-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly

being obvious over Zintel in view of Saint and further in view of Fedotov. Applicant

respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments presented herein.

Independent Claim 6

Claim 6, as amended herein, recites, in part:

the customizable tag-based document also describing a state of the

service representing a device for an input/output event and a state of the

input/output event that has been generated by the service representing

the device.

The above language was not part of this claim and therefore was not considered

by the Office when rejecting this claim. However, very similar language was considered

by the Office when claim 21 was examined and the Office failed to cite any of the cited

references as including this feature of claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the

Office will not find this same feature in this claim as represented by the amended claim

language herein.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of cited references

does not teach or suggest all of the features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 8-15

Claims 8-15 ultimately depend from independent claim 6. As discussed above,

claim 6 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 8-15 are also

allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an

allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103

rejection of claims 8-15.

Independent Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended herein, recites, in part:

receiving a customizable tag-based message that contains a state

of the service representing the device and the input/output event that has

been generated by the service representing the device.

Much of the above language was not part of this claim and therefore was not

considered by the Office when rejecting this claim. However, very similar language was

considered by the Office when claim 21 was examined and the Office failed to cite any

of the cited references as including this feature of claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant

submits that the Office will not find this same feature in this claim, as represented by the

amended claim language herein.

For at least the reasons presented herein, the combination of cited references

does not teach or suggest all of the features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103 rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 17, 18 and 20

Claims 17, 18 and 20 ultimately depend from independent claim 16. As

discussed above, claim 16 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17,

18 and 20 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their

Serial No.: 10/717,830 Atty Docket No.: MS1-4172US Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie

www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256

dependency from an allowable base claim, and also for the additional features that each

recites.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the 103

rejection of claims 17, 18 and 20.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, all pending claims are in condition for

allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the

application.

If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application, Applicant

requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a

subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Representative for Applicant

/kaseychristie40559/

Kasey C. Christie

(kasey@leehayes.com; 509-944-4732)

Registration No. 40,559

Atty Docket No.: MS1-4172US Atty/Agent: Kasey C. Christie

Serial No.: 10/717,830

Dated: <u>07/26/2010</u>